IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12-10-2007

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.CHOCKALINGAM

W.P.Nos.18517 and 18518 of 2007

and
MP Nos.1 and 2 of 2007 in WP No.18518/2007
and
MP No.1 of 2007 in WP No.18517/2007

R.Venkatesan .. Petitioner in both petitions

vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. By its Secretary to the Government
Home Transport-II Department
Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009.
2.The Special Commissioner and Transport Commissioner
Office of Transport Commissioner
Chepauk, Chennai 600 005. .. Respondents in both petitions

WP No.18517 of 2007 filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a writ of certiorarified mandamus calling for the records relating to the proceedings made in Proc.R.No.T1/23327/2007 (F.O.No.207/07) dated 9.5.2007 passed by the second respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to promote the petitioner to the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Grade I.

WP No.18518 of 2007 filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a writ of certiorarified mandamus calling for the records relating to the proceedings made in Memo R.No.75848/V4/05 dated 4.5.2006 passed by the second respondent and quash the same and consequently forbear the respondents from proceeding with the enquiry pursuant to the aforesaid charge memo.

For Petitioner in both the petitions : Mr.G.Ethirajulu

For Respondents in both petitions : Mr.V.Arun
Additional Government Pleader

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

COMMON ORDER

The petitioner has challenged the proceedings of the second respondent namely the Special Commissioner and Transport Commissioner, Madras, made in Proc.R.No.T1/23327/2007 (F.O.No.207/07) dated 9.5.2007 and in Memo R.No.75848/V4/05 dated 4.5.2006, by filing these two writ petitions respectively. He also seeks a direction to the respondents to promote the petitioner to the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Grade-I and seeks to forbear the respondents from proceeding with the enquiry pursuant to the aforesaid charge memo.

2.The affidavits in support of the petitions are perused. The Court heard the learned Counsel on either side.

3.Concededly, the petitioner who was appointed as Motor Vehicle Inspector Grade-II on 7.12.2000, was working at the Regional Transport Office, Dharmapuri. During the relevant time, he was working in the Office of the Deputy Transport Commissioner, Salem. He was again transferred to Motor Vehicle Inspectors Unit Office, Hosur, on 12.11.2005, and he joined duty on 17.11.2005 and was working so. While so, 19.11.2005 and 20.11.2005 were holidays, and he went on medical leave from 21.11.2005 to 27.11.2005. He joined duty on 28.11.2005. While he was actually on duty that day, there was a surprise inspection made by the Officials of the District Cell. Following the same, there was a charge memo issued on 4.5.2006, under Rule 17(b) of the Tamil Nadu Civil Service (Discipline and Appeal) Rules, containing three charges. He also put forth his reply stating that the contents of the charges were false. Then, the Deputy Transport Commissioner, Salem, was appointed as Enquiry Officer, and it was conducted on two occasions. But, he retired from service. Thereafter, a fresh Enquiry Officer was appointed. Under the circumstances, these two writ petitions have been brought forth.

4.The learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that in the instant case, the charges were framed against him for negligence and of devotion to duty; that a single allegation was multiplied into three charges; but, no allegation was made that the petitioner has committed these irregularities; that further, the charge memo was vague, and it lacks in material particulars; that no direct allegations were made to attract Rule 17(b); that even assuming without admitting that the charges are true, it would not attract any major punishment; but, it would come only under Rule 17(a) of the said Rules; that the first Enquiry Officer, appointed, has also retired; that the second Enquiry Officer has been appointed; but, they have not taken initiative; that the matter is pending for a longtime; that the chance of promotion was also deterred by the pendency of the same, and under the circumstances, it has got to be quashed.

5.Contrary to the above contentions, the learned Additional Government Pleader would submit that it is true that there was a surprise inspection where it was found that eight brokers were found inside the Office; that apart from that, an unaccounted money of Rs.21,165/- was recovered from them; that further, an unclaimed amount of Rs.3,370/- was

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

found and seized within the Office premises of Motor Vehicle Inspector, Hosur; that there was also a third charge to the effect that there was a shortage in the closing balance; that explanations were given, but not found to be satisfactory; that the Enquiry Officer was appointed, who retired; that another Enquiry Officer has been appointed, who has to proceed with the enquiry, and under the circumstances, the writ petitions have been brought forth.

6.Added further the learned Additional Government Pleader that after the explanations were brought forth, it was found that the charges would attract only Rule 17 (a) of the said Rules and not 17 (b); that the authorities had no power to amend the same; that they have placed the matter before the State Government for amending the same; that it is awaited, and under the circumstances, the writ petitions have got to be dismissed permitting the department to proceed with the enquiry of the matter.

7.The Court paid its anxious considerations on the submissions made.

8.It is not in controversy that the petitioner was working as Motor Vehicle Inspector, Hosur, during the relevant time. The surprise inspection, according to the department, was made on 28.11.2005. But, in the instant case, a charge memo was issued only on 4.5.2006 i.e., nearly after a period of six months. It remains to be stated that if the allegations contained in the charges, were true, there could not have been such a delay. That apart, the first Enquiry Officer was also appointed after a period of six months, and he also retired. The second Enquiry Officer was appointed, and it is pending. Now, at this juncture, it is pertinent to point out that the charges levelled against the petitioner, which are incorporated in the memo, are placed in the hands of the Court. A perusal of the same would indicate that three charges were mentioned. The first charge was that the brokers eight in number, were inside the Office, and they were also having a money of Rs.21,165/-, which was seized from them. The second charge was that an unclaimed amount of Rs.3,370/- was found and seized within the Office premises of the Motor Vehicle Inspector, Hosur. The third charge was that there was a shortage of Rs.348/- noticed in the closing cash balance. As far as the charge No.2 was concerned, wherefrom Rs.3,370/- was actually seized was not made known. Further, it was simply mentioned that it was seized from the Motor Vehicle Inspector's Office premises. As regards the third charge, there was a shortage of Rs.348/- noticed, and it can be attributed only to the Cashier and not to the petitioner herein.

9.The learned Counsel for the petitioner brought to the notice of the Court that there were eight brokers inside the office, and it is not clear from whom the unaccounted money of Rs.21,165/- was recovered. It is pertinent to point out that as per the guidelines for deciding the charge under Rule 17(b), there must be an irregularity or the negligence in the discharge of the official duty with the dishonest motive. In the case on hand, merely because eight brokers were found inside the office and they were also found in possession of the unaccounted money of Rs.21,165/-, it

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

cannot be attributed to the petitioner. Only if there is dishonest motive noticed, then it could be attributed; but, in this case, it is not so. Under the circumstances, the framing of charges under Rule 17(b) was not at all warranted.

10.Now, the learned Additional Government Pleader would submit that after noticing the explanation, the authorities came to know that the facts would not attract a charge under Rule 17(b), and they have applied to the Government for amending the charge as one for Rule 17(a). This contention cannot be accepted since the matter is pending for a longtime. Even assuming that there was a charge under Rule 17(a), no question of deterring him from getting further promotion would arise, and it is not warranted so. Thus, the charges levelled against him, in the opinion of this Court, do not stand. This Court is of the view that the charges have got to be necessarily quashed. That apart, the order of the second respondent rejecting the petitioner's claim to be included in the panel for the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Grade I is also liable to be quashed. Accordingly, they are quashed. The respondents are also directed to consider the promotion of the petitioner to which he is legally entitled, taking into consideration that the charges levelled against him, have been quashed by this Court as above, in accordance with law as expeditiously as practicable. Accordingly, both the writ petitions are disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected MPs are closed.

nsv/

Sd/
Asst. Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

To:

1.The Secretary to the Government
Home Transport-II Department
Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009.

2.The Special Commissioner and
Transport Commissioner
Office of Transport Commissioner
Chepauk, Chennai 600 005.

+ 2 cc to Mr. G. Ethirajulu, Advocte sR 63018, 63019

KU (co)

sg 17/10/07

WP Nos.18517 and
18518 of 2007
Dt: 12-10-2007

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/